**To:** Brock, Martha[Brock.Martha@epa.gov]

Cc: Johnson, MaryC[Johnson.MaryC@epa.gov]; Alexander, Shanna[Alexander.Shanna@epa.gov]; Richards, Jon

M.[Richards.Jon@epa.gov]; Froede, Carl[Froede.Carl@epa.gov]

From: Amoroso, Cathy[/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=C5033745779E4121B626D62341A9B89C-AMOROSO, CATHY]

**Sent:** Thur 4/8/2021 3:30:48 PM (UTC)

Subject: ORR administrators decision implementation - dilution factor issue

DQO Step #2 and #5 16MAR2021.docx

Sample calculation of rad discharge limit 16MAR2021.docx

## Martha

I don't think the 64X dilution factor is set in stone. It was a verbal proposal by UCOR at a project team meeting. There was a slide deck presented that included some stream flow information, but I don't have the slides. I'm cc:ing the rest of the project team to see if anyone has anything to add about a dilution factor of 64. I believe it is based on the median stream flow at BCK 4.5 compared to BCK 9.2 (we had a discussion about mean vs media) – Shanna may remember more.

Attached are two informal project documents that refer to a dilution faction, but neither provides a specific dilution factor (64 or otherwise).

Cathy Amoroso, Chief Restoration & DOE Coordination Section Superfund & Emergency Management Division U.S. EPA, Region 4 404-295-6758

From: Brock, Martha <Brock.Martha@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 8, 2021 10:13 AM

**To:** Amoroso, Cathy <Amoroso.Cathy@epa.gov> **Cc:** Johnson, MaryC <Johnson.MaryC@epa.gov>

Subject: 64X

Could you share what DOE has put in writing about where the fishing hole is and how they are calculating to end up at 64X "dilution".

Martha Brock

Senior Attorney, Federal Facilities; EPA Region 4

61 Forsyth St., SW; Atlanta, GA 30303

Ph: (404) 562-9546

Work Cell: (470) 512-7133

If the agency's interpretation deviates from prior policy, the agency must provide a reasoned basis for the change. *Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro*, 136 S. Ct. 2117, 2125–26 (2016).